DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 695 HE 009 968

TITLE	The Contemporary College President: Pressures and Challenges.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	61p.; Selected papers from the Summer Council of Presidents, 1977
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; *Chief Administrators; *College Administration; Conflict Resolution; Family Involvement; *Governance; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; Management; *Presidents; Retrenchment; *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS	Institutional Renewal

ABSTRACT

The papers include: the college president, 25 years ago and now (Henry L. Ashmore); pressures on the presidential family (Clare S. Mackey); strategies for coping (James Bond); remaining an academic leader and being president (Arliss L. Roaden); role of the chief executive in institutional self-renewal (John A. Marvel); on leadership and management in American colleges and universities (James A. Robinson). (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154695

THE CONTEMPORARY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

PRESSURES AND CHALLENGES

Selected Papers From The
Summer Council Of Presidents
1977

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

HE009948

aascu

THE CONTEMPORARY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

PRESSURES AND CHALLENGES

Selected Papers From The
Summer Council of Presidents
1977

Published by
The American Association of State Colleges
and Universities
Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070
Allan W. Ostar, Executive Director
Sandi Ralston, Editor
March 1978

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

The College President—25 Years Ago and Now 2
Henry L. Ashmore, President, Armstrong State College

Pressures on the Presidential Family 9
Clare S. Mackey, Texas Tech University

Strategies for Coping 16
James Bond, President, California State University, Sacramento

Remaining an Academic Leader and Being President 23
Arliss L. Roaden, President, Tennessee Technological University

Role of the Chief Executive in Institutional Self-Renewal 33
John A. Marvel, President, Consortium of State Colleges and Universities of Colorado

On Leadership and Management in American Colleges and Universities 38
James A. Robinson, President and Professor of Political Science, The University of West Florida

Introduction

The following papers were presented at the Sixth Biennial Summer Council of Presidents of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Ashland, Oregon, August 8-13, 1977.

"The Contemporary College President: Pressures and Challenges", the Council's theme, examined both personal and professional pressures on the president and the president's family. The six papers examine the challenges and pressures confronting a president today compared to those of the 1950's; the difficulty of remaining an academic leader while functioning as an effective manager/president; the chief executive's role in institutional self-renewal, and personal pressures faced by the president and the president's family.

AASCU is an organization of 325 regional state colleges and universities located in 47 states, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands. Two-thirds of its member institutions have graduate programs, and many offer less-than-baccalaureate programs leading to associate degrees or certification. AASCU members represent the fastest-growing group of four-year institutions in the nation, with an enrollment of approximately 2.5 million--25 percent of the total national student population, and 30 percent of those in four-year institutions.

The College President—25 Years Ago and Now

Henry L. Ashmore
President
Armstrong State College

What I am going to attempt to do in this paper is to discuss the kinds of pressures the average college and/or university president experienced approximately twenty-five years ago compared to the kinds of pressures the average president experiences today.

I have been a public college president for almost 25 years. I can remember very clearly my first day at work, and I can contrast easily in my own mind the dramatic differences in kinds of pressures 25 years ago vis-a-vis today. I have thought often that if I were a clever writer I could write of these years—in fact, I have a title. I would call it Pity the Poor President. You can make what you wish out of the alliteration, the first letters of the three major words, or of any acronym you might devise.

How well I remember the first day and the first year of my presidency. Two events stand out—each in a way is indicative of the pressures I experienced.

The first day I reported early to work. Being young and fairly ignorant, I thought the single most important function I would have would be to look and act as a president should. About 8:30 a.m. my secretary came in to say the Registrar was waiting in the outer office and that he had an urgent problem for which he needed to get a solution. She was told to send him in. I braced myself, took a deep breath, and asked him what the problem was. He said, "Dr. Ashmore, what are you going to do about the Navy?"

I thought, "Dear God, what do I have to do with the Navy." Finally, I asked him just what was it that I was to do about the Navy. Very seriously he told me that I must decide that day whether or not the college should charge out-of-state tuition to the Navy service personnel.

How relieved I was! Trying to appear very judicious, I quickly told him we would not charge out-of-state tuition to Navy personnel. After he left, I realized that I

did not have the slightest idea if I had the authority to make such a decision, how it would affect the budget, or what the state laws and/or policies were in this matter.

I had experienced my first "pressure" as a college president.

Somewhat later in the same year, a student caught me on the campus and asked me, "Why do you close the bookstore during the noon hour?" I told him I did not know that I did. He said, "Yes sir, the Administration did". My response was to ask him to go with me to see the bookstore manager. We found the manager in the cafeteria eating. He expressed surprise that the bookstore was closed, so I recruited him to go with us to the bookstore.

Sure enough, there was a sign on the bookstore stating "Closed from 12:30 until 1:30 p.m. by order of the Administration."

Inside we found a very embarrassed student assistant eating his lunch. Apparently his class schedule left no time to eat lunch; therefore, he had decided to close the bookstore this hour. According to him, he made the sign as he did because he thought no one would question an order by the Administration.

I guess I was lucky. I learned early who the Administration on my campus was—a student assistant in the bookstore!

That is a humorous example, but it does illustrate one type of pressure existing then, and now, with which a president has to cope. That is the pressure of having to bear the burden of, and live with, unwise decisions made by others on the campus.

What were the major kinds of pressures experienced by presidents 25 years ago? Some that existed then still exist today. In fact, many of them still do exist. However, there are three major differences. One major difference is in the number of such pressures—there are significantly more today. A second major difference lies in the fact that 25 years ago most of the pressures felt were "success, or positive, pressures"; today many of the pressures are "failure, or negative, pressures." A rapidly growing campus and student body accompanied by an expanding budget is a "success pressure." The third major difference is in the intensity of such pressures. They are far more intense today, and, therefore, more debilitating in their effect on the individual.

Very quickly, let us examine some of the major pressures of 25 years ago:

1. As illustrated above, there was the pressure of having to assume the responsibility of someone else's decisions and/or actions. This very real pressure is perennially present. The best solution is to eliminate, as quickly as possible, those persons who habitually create problems. To do this means the president must be one of the men—not one of the boys.

2. There were the pressures of expanding enrollments, insufficient physical facilities, negligible pools of faculty, etc. These, though, are "success pressures" and create mostly problems involving energy and physical time.

3. There were the pressures to create images of greatness for colleges, to shed the history of being junior colleges and teacher education institutions, and to make colleges appear to be better than they really were.

4. There was the pressure then, as now, of working with several different vested interest groups—the legislature, the parents (sometimes known as the tax payer group), the alumni, etc. Conspicuously lacking in those days was the pressure of confrontation with student groups. A few discipline problems existed, but those were about the extent of student headaches. Also, there was not the same kind, or intensity, of faculty pressures. The unions were then unborn on college campuses.

5. Political pressure was exerted in those days, but not as much as now. As a matter of fact, it was interesting in those days to observe how attentive legislators would be to college presidents in the legislative halls and to note the respect with which the legislators treated the average college president.

6. There was then on the horizon, a new kind of pressure developing. This took form in the "witch hunts" following in the wake of McCarthyism. Presidents were pressured to "get rid" of Communists (if they could find them). of extreme liberals (as if a liberal can be other than extreme), of homosexuals, and any other person who was different or subversive. Today, of course, these individuals have almost become folk heroes and can command large fees to come to the campus to speak.

There really were not that many pressures existing 25 years ago, and those which did exist were manageable. Life for the average president was very pleasant; the faculty was reasonable, the students were respectful, the pace was slow, the enrollment was growing, and college administrators barely knew there was a federal government. The two most serious pressures were that of wheedling enough funds out of the legislature to operate the college and that of dealing with the "witch hunt" mentality.

But Topsy grew, and the serpent came to live in the college heaven. The circumstances surrounding a college president today vis-a-vis 25 years ago as illustrated by pressures inflicted on the president are almost staggering. It is much more difficult for the president of today to retain good mental and physical health, to forestall depression, and to remain sanguine. Let us examine some of the more human-felt pressures experienced by an average president today. The listing is not intended to be exhaustive; neither is the ranking of the pressures of any significance. Rather, the first listed pressures are simply those which are more obvious, or, in some cases, more definable.

1. Declining enrollments and/or shrinking budgets. This type of pressure has been earlier defined as a "failure, or negative, problem." This term has nothing to do with the president as an individual; it is used in a descriptive sense to denote that there are problems that defy solution. Practically every four-year college president will feel the intense pressure of trying to cope with this fact-of-life.

2. Connected directly with the above will be the pressure to achieve more efficiency with less money. Included in this pressure will be the maintaining of quality and standards with less resources.

3. A relatively new pressure, and perhaps one with some merit (but a pressure, nevertheless), is that of Sunshine Laws. However this is called, and however good the practice is, it still creates a kind of pressure on the president.

4. Another relatively new development in most states which creates pressures and problems is that of state coordinating boards. Again, this may be a most worthwhile and needed development; however, such boards do become a new dimension of pressures on the president.

5. The pressure of competing for non-government funds is one that is a reasonably Johnny-come-lately to most state college and university presidents. As adequate state and federal funds have become more difficult to obtain and as inflation has robbed such funds of needed purchasing power, the poor president finds himself standing with hat in hand with all the other supplicants for these non-government funds.

6. Unions. It almost suffices to simply say the word and add a period. I can remember when faculty unions were not even the proverbial glint in the eye of even John L. Lewis. To state that coping with unionization of faculties and other personnel on a campus creates pressures for the president is to overstate an obvious truth. However, this is real life, and unions are a part of real life.

7. The greatest difference in kinds of pressures developing these past 25 years is dramatically illustrated in the pressure of the federal government on college presidents. This is the pressure which is so prevailing and pervasive that one is almost suffocated by it. There are the myriad reports, the tons of regulations, the plethora of visits, the assininity of goals and/or quotas, the not-so-subtle threats, the pomposity and posturing, and the eerie Alice-in-Wonderland scenes of interaction with federalia. There are rules and regulations ad infinitum—on race, on females, on handicapped persons, on due process, on building safety, on sex, etc. When engaged in relationships with the federal government, I always think of the Great Bayg in Peer Gynt, the mild, invisible, limp monster that held him prisoner, seeming so hopeless to fight against. Twenty-five years ago about the only contact a president had with the federal government was on April 15 when he paid his income tax.

8. News media create pressures on the president today which were largely lacking 25 years ago. Basically, there are three kinds of news stories which periodically face the president. One is the one-day interest story—the president can usually hide from it by not being available for 24 hours. One is the three-day interest story—the president can escape from this one by leaving town for three days. The last and more serious one is the seven day or longer interest story—the president is going to have to face it sooner or later, so he might as well do it sooner.

9. There are what I commonly call the "group " pressures. Many of these are under-girded by the federal government, hence the pressure intensifies. These groups, for instance, are the Black group, the female group, the homosexual group, etc. In many ways, the next to federal government pressures, these pressures can be the most difficult and frustrating of all to handle. Inherent in the pressures brought by the groups can be found some of the most inhumane and non-defensible charges with which a president must contend.

10. Not to be overlooked is the pressure of demands by students, both individually and collectively. These pressures come through both organized and unorganized sources. It could be group threats; it could be the student government; it could be rioters; it could be from any direction.

11. A pressure increasingly more difficult to handle is that of loss of privacy. There is no doubt that this loss of privacy has increased significantly during the past several years, and is increasingly more difficult to deal with effectively.

12. Closely related to this are time and energy pressures. These are never ending and never satisfiable. Today with air travel, for instance, an alumni group 1,000 miles away will think it great for the president to fly over one morning, make a luncheon speech, fly back that afternoon and spend several hours in the office. This would have been impossible 25 years ago.

13. An invidious kind of pressure is that created by the fact this is an age of questioning, of cynicism, of know-it-all. Everyone today is more capable than, more knowledgeable than, more intelligent than, more cynical of, more condemning of than, anyone else. No one trusts anyone else. The faculty and the students know—and I mean know—the president is either hiding something or outright lying. How suspicious each of us is of the other. How difficult it is to cope with this.

14. One pressure that is frequently overlooked is that of the declining authority to manage. The president is so hemmed in by so many authorities, and his possible options are so controlled by other agencies, that he becomes some kind of automated clerk. The frustrations growing out of such reduced options, along with overall restrictions in general, can reach such proportions as to preclude any effective action.

15. Another pressure exerted on all presidents is one that is difficult to identify, and if identified, is difficult to explain. Suffice it at this point simply to call it "reforms" to historical ways of doing things. Changes occur with such rapidity and reforms of years-old customs and ways are being demanded and implemented with such regularity that it is almost impossible to keep secure knowledge and perspectives. However, the effect of dealing with those changes can easily become one of the pressures with which the president must cope.

16. The last pressure is one of the spirit and, therefore, one of the most significant. It is the pressure which results from the prevailing and continuous feeling of being disliked. It is popular today for everyone to dislike, and frequently rebel against, any form of authority or administrative figure. The faculty, the students, the parents, the alumni, and, frequently, the trustees all dislike the president—or so the president often thinks. The very fact that the president makes decisions between and among persons daily will create unhappiness or dislike, or both, on the part of one or several of the persons. To live with this, both at the conscious and unconscious level, can affect the spirit of the president even as cancer affects the body.

The above illustrations and examples are not intended to be exhaustive. Rather they have been used to try to create a contrast between the pressures felt by presidents 25 years ago and those of today. I hope this paper has not caused a sense of negativism for this certainly was not the desired effect. It has been an attempt to dramatize the changed position of the presidents vis-a-vis pressures and to illustrate the changes in a somewhat vivid manner. The position of the president today is a challenging one, an interesting one, and, I think, a desirable one. It is, though, a difficult one and aspirants should be aware of the difficulties.

The position of being a president of a public college or university today is a fascinating one. Publications are full of requirements, characteristics, or traits needed.

A recent listing of required characteristics for a presidency included:

Wisdom of Solomon
Strength of Hercules
Cunning of Machiavelli
Charm of Casanova
Spirit of David
Beauty of Adonis

Personally, I would settle for two characteristics which are beautifully illustrated by a line in Sir Walter Scott's Lady of the Lake. It reads: "The will to do, the soul to dare."

Pressures on the Presidential Family

Clare S. Mackey
Texas Tech University

Those of us connected with universities are a fortunate lot. The young people of today are exciting to be around. They are full of goals and enthusiasm for their future. The faculty includes many innovative, stimulating individuals. It is a pleasure to be in on most of the work of a state university.

Families of university presidents do, however, have their fair share of pressures. Of course, most families do. Some people seem to be able to cope, and some do not. A recent case in point—a news service wire story of July 21, 1977, told of a California psychiatrist who had just been arrested for allegedly hiring a "hit man" to murder a fellow physician! Now this might be just a normal crime story if we were not also told that the accused, would-be murderer, was the co-author of a book entitled Coping with Living, How to Handle Your Emotional Problems! Of course this was carrying things a bit far, even among California psychiatrists, but in all fairness, we need to recognize that most of us, at one time or another, have felt pushed close to, or perhaps beyond, the point of being able to cope.

As I mentioned, all families have pressures that bear on them. By the same token all of us, as individuals, are constantly subjected to pressures, tensions, or anxieties of one kind or another. If that were not so, what dull, unproductive lives we would lead, and how bland a society we would have. We need to understand that it is normal for us to experience the various kinds of pressures. We must learn to recognize and understand the effect on our systems and our behavior of the pressures that researchers characterize generally as stress. Not only do we need to come to grips with the fact that stress is a normal part of life, we also need to realize that we regularly go out of our way to create stressful situations, and that much of our growth and development—physical, intellectual and emotional—is the result of our experiencing stress.

We vary widely in our personal characteristics, but most of us sense innately the need to experience certain types of stress and derive the benefits that come from

meeting it successfully. We understand the desire to enter into competition, to seek outer limits, to risk danger or to challenge the unknown. We engage in athletic contests, run for office, play chess, seek certification for our talents or abilities and submit our thoughts or deeds to public judgement. But whether one does more or one does less—whether the stress is totally self-generated or is largely imposed—the process and the results are much the same.

There is a fine line for each of us that determines just how much stress we can tolerate. According to medical experts, each individual is born with a finite amount of stress-fighting ability, and while this amount can be decreased through life, for example, as a result of accidents or poor health, so far scientists have not learned how to increase stress-fighting elements in our system through regeneration, injection, or transplantation. Scientists have demonstrated that physical changes do take pleace in our bodies when we are under stress and they know, for example, that the hormone and adrenal glands are affected. They also know that when the system is pushed beyond its ability to cope there may be a breakdown, with the results ranging from undue fatigue and increased susceptibility of infection, to such illnesses as hypertension, ulcers, cardiovascular diseases, or mental breakdown. The type of reaction and the degree of severity of the reaction are highly individualized, as are the causes of stress.

The best that scientists have been able to do so far is provide us some insights into the nature of stress and its causes, advise individuals to study themselves, learn their own susceptibility to stress, and their capacities for coping with it, and suggest that people adapt their life styles so that they expand themselves wisely.

If we are to comprehend the types of pressures that characterize the presidential family, it will help if we look first at presidents to get some ideas of who they are—the type individuals they are, their backgrounds and how they have come to occupy the offices they hold. The literature gives us a reasonably good picture. The typical university president in the U.S. today, and more specifically, the typical president of an AASCU institution is a male who came to office between his early 40's and mid 50's. He is married and has a modest size family. He probably came from a middle class family and may well be a first-generation college graduate. His success can be attributed to his own personal hard work and academic achievement. He may have helped finance his college education, especially his graduate work, (a wife may well have worked to help put him through his doctoral program) and he probably served a tour in the military. Even recognizing his talents, he is very likely an over-achiever, a demanding person, one with high expectations of himself and those around him—subordinates, colleagues, and yes, his family too—both wife and children.

Here, obviously, is a major cause for stress in presidential families right off the bat. Of course we must recognize that if the presidents had chosen some other line of work, were employed elsewhere, chances are they would be just about the same—probably as successful, having similar kinds of responsibility, and no less demanding.

Now that we have a profile of the president, let's examine the nature of the job of university president in contemporary society.

Clark Kerr gave what has come to be a classic description of the university presidency:

The university president in the United States is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. Above all, he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies.

Kerr observes that on one can be all these things, and that some succeed at being none.

The description is as perceptive as it is entertaining, and illustrates well what I judge to be the most important and consequential characteristics of the public university presidency, and those most relevant to any understanding of the stress experienced by presidential families.

The job is highly complex, requiring constant involvement in the broadest possible range of substantive areas with highly skilled and extensively trained people. The position must deal with multiple and widely varying constituencies. The job is demanding—frequently all-consuming—physically, intellectually and emotionally. The university presidency is a public office of high visibility, subject to unending scrutiny from the media as well as the public at large.

University presidencies are certainly not the only difficult or stress-producing jobs an individual can hold, nor are they unique as jobs that create pressures on the

family of the job-holder. Airline pilots, policemen, medical doctors, professional athletes, musicians, merchant seamen, elected politicians, and their families, experience the stress of long hours, travel, danger, separation, demanding standards, media exposure, and many other difficult responsibilities. But few occupations combine the characteristics of the university presidency or can match it in terms of outright complexity and difficulty.

The historic image of the university president as a dignified, if somewhat stuffy, scholar-turned-administrator as retirement age approaches undoubtedly has added to current-day problems. Before the 1960's, the job of a university president was not ordinarily considered to be especially difficult or complicated. Then came student unrest and disruption, followed by a period of financial difficulty ranging from gradual deterioration to instant crises, the onslaught of collective bargaining and the era of public disenchantment with higher education, including, too often, faculty and administrators. The fact that presidents had been selected by boards retaining previous attitudes may have led to choosing some who were not suited by temperament or training to cope with the crises that became so commonplace on many of our campuses.

Confrontation became an established way of doing business even where it was not daily occurence. Concern for security and precaution against violence became a matter of constant awareness, and crisis management became a relatively routine administrative approach. Attitudes have had to change. There are, after all, few things that cause greater stress more quickly than a large gap between expectations and reality.

The nature of the university president's job is likely to have pervasive effects on the family, even to the extent of affecting its ability to survive as a unit. The president and the family need to understand the individual and the job as fully as possible and it is my belief that two principals are absolutely essential:

Be realistic and address the issues together.

It is impossible to solve most problems unless you are willing to face them squarly and acknowledge what they are rather than treating them as you wish they were. We mustn't try to kid ourselves. We must remember that we are dealing with family matters, not individual concerns to be treated in isolation by any single person. This is not to suggest that a spouse should be involved in a president's business—far from it. That is normally an invitation to trouble all its own. But the family implications of the job and its impact on the president, spouse and children, and on the family as a unit are quite a different matter.

For new presidents, the family assessment should be made as part of the initial consideration of whether or not to take the job. For those in office, periodic reassessment and reevaluation should be the normal pattern. Older children in the family should actively participate in the considerations, while the interests of younger children deserve specific attention even if they have only a limited, indirect role to play.

For openers, it is important to ask candidly how badly a person wants to be a university president. Does the attainment of the office represent fulfilling a major ambition? Is it necessary to hold the office to do certain types of things that are important professionally? Are the trappings of office especially important? Does the commitment to the office represent a sacrifice in terms of career or life style?

Equally important is the question of how badly a wife wants to be a president's wife. Will the role afford opportunities that are valued but would be unavailable otherwise? Will the responsibilities limit her personal or professional choices? Will she be able to retain, to a satisfactory degree, her own identity?

What are the financial ramifications from a family standpoint? Does the job offer economic rewards beyond what might be available otherwise, or does it represent a trade-off of longer term security for current income and a different standard or style of living? How will the public nature of the office affect the president, the wife and the children? What quality of care will be available to young children when parents are busy or away? How much privacy will each give up willingly, and for how long? What are the probable limitations of the term of office and the most likely prospects for employment or retirement following the presidency? And what about geography—is the location a plus or a minus? Would you want to live in the area after being president and president's family there, or will a move be virtually inevitable?

The ability to answer such questions requires a very clear understanding of the terms of employment of the president—a careful analysis of the expectations of the president by the board, by the campus, and by the community. Just as important is an understanding of the expectations of the president's wife and family by the board, the campus, the community, and by the president.

If those expectations are not sufficiently clear and if the president and the family do not acknowledge and accept them, there is probably no way that the family can deal with the pressures that will be generated by the job.

By way of example, the high visibility of most university presidencies can be a

major problem. The media frequently transforms a rather characteristic academician into a local or regional personality, continually before the public. The president may even take on the appearance of a glamorous celebrity, active in society and living in great comfort with a more than adequate salary—a salary that is often cited regardless of its relevance to the particular story of the moment. All of this can have very undersirable effects on the family. (A few families have actually started believing all they heard and got themselves into serious financial troubles!)

I have indicated that the wife must know what is expected of her by her husband, his board, the community, faculty and students. She must either be prepared to try to meet their expectations, or she must learn to say "no"—or at least to negotiate. If she has her own career outside the home, she will have to reconcile it with the role of president's wife and gain acceptance of the accommodation.

It is also important for the family to know itself—its own personal values. Criticisms are always being hurled at public figures. The best way for a family to protect itself from being hurt by every "cheap-shot" from the student newspaper, or innuendo from a neighbor's child is for the family members to be secure in the knowledge that their values are sound, behavior honest, and efforts sincere. The parents must be alert to the need to communicate with children and let them know how to take criticism so that they are not unduly hurt.

Criticism is only one side of the story, though. For some, the greater problem may be undue praise or adulation. There are always those who are anxious to tell you what they think you want to hear. We certainly can't take all that seriously, and we must teach children how to deal with such problems. Children must also understand that if they are living in a "presidential mansion," they are living in a state-owned home, and that many presidential families would not expect, nor desire the same life style in a different job. The whole family needs to remember that the husband is a public servant, not a public "Lord". Great stress is caused simply by a person trying to be someone he or she is not. It takes tremendous energies for any of us to play the role of someone we are not, and it profits us little.

It is vital to know how to recognize the signs of stress and to know ways of adapting when stress starts taking over. Undoubtedly the most effective thing is for the president and the family to be prepared in four ways: intellectually, physically, economically, and spiritually.

To be prepared intellectually, one should have interests that go beyond the

dimensions of the present job and time. Such interests, whether vocational or avocational—teaching, research, writing, the arts, hobbies—cannot be developed on the spot as stress relievers. To be meaningful they require continuing commitment over time, even when one is totally involved in a present job assignment.

Physical preparation requires concern for fitness before problems arise. One does not have to commit to high-level competitive athletics to achieve "fitness after forty" (or before forty). We now have more than enough valid scientific data concerning the importance of proper diet, regular exercise, and adequate rest to convince rational people of what is important for all members of the family for normal well-being and to provide useful reserves.

From the standpoint of economics, the family should pay attention to its needs, taking time to assure basic stability for the future, in full recognition of the kinds of uncertainties that may exist. A president probably will have limited time for consulting or other income-generating activities and must constantly be alert to possible conflicts of interest. Serving "at the pleasure of the board" has to be taken seriously, as does serving at the president's own pleasure and at the pleasure of his family.

Preparation of the spiritual being is also important. The great majority of those who become university presidents are basically service-oriented by nature. They and their families tend to understand easily the importance of personal belief in something beyond self. But this, like intellectual, physical, and economic preparation, requires specific attention and commitment over time and as a family matter.

To conclude, it is extremely important to be introspective, communicative, and honest with one another within the family. A common understanding and acceptance of goals can lead to a healthy ability by the whole family to thrive and enjoy the exciting life it leads. Some may not choose to cope with stress—particularly if the rewards are not the ones they desire. If they do not so choose, to preserve one's sanity and well-being, it would be wise to decide early to heed one president's advice: "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Strategies for Coping

James Bond
President
California State University, Sacramento

As you have been reading in the Chronicle and in other sources, we've been living with probably the most intense stress in the country during the past five years. The past year has been a stressful one at California State University, Sacramento; and because of this, I think I can share the kinds of mechanisms that were effective in dealing with this stress. I do believe that what is happening in Sacramento is an indicator of what can happen on other campuses. Some of what is happening is, frankly, scarey; but that doesn't mean that the situation is unmanageable. There are techniques and strategies for coping successfully. Sacramento is described as a troubled campus. It is troubled, deeply troubled, but I think we probably have the best chance that we've ever had of stabilizing the situation.

One of the things that is important in terms of learning to cope with stress and challenges when they come along is the need first of all to recognize the signs of stress within ourselves. Presidents, and sometimes presidents' families, are high achievers; we are where we are sometimes because of very strong ego needs. The expectations that exist for us—on the part of other people and ourselves - are high. (Sometimes I actually believe that we think we are omnipotent.) Because of this, it is sometimes very difficult to recognize that things are happening with which we are not dealing well. This is complicated by the very strong human tendency to make tiny compensations and adjustments for stress and tension when they arise so that frequently, by the time we become aware of the fact that we're in trouble, we're in pretty deep trouble.

We have not learned to recognize the early signs of stress when they occur. Stress is reflected in highly individual ways; and there are things that you can notice if you have the capacity for introspection. The challenge to know thyself is a very meaningful and very real challenge. You ought to know by this time in life what your style is, what your characteristic way of dealing with pressure and stress is.

Some of us somaticize it, we internalize it, and it reflects itself in a series of bodily symptoms. Some people have heart thumps and suffer hyperventilation symptoms; some experience it through muscular tension. We simply start having aches and pains, a shoulder that is aching, and there is no real reason for it, it's just been aching for awhile and you've suddenly become aware of the fact that it's aching. Or a series of headaches, or your neck is stiff and sore, and it's because sometimes in the attempt to hold ourselves together, we actually are muscularly holding ourselves together.

Some people also experience disturbances related to sleep. They go to sleep at night and then wake up and can't get back to sleep. That generally is a fairly classic sign of depression. To some people just the opposite happens: they're sleepy all the time, they don't want to face reality when they are awake. That sometimes is a very nice avoidance mechanism, it's a way of getting away from the pressures. Also, if you are an individual who uses alcohol, you can find yourself taking one extra drink, two extra drinks, you're beginning to drink just a little too much because there's a greater need to relax. It's a tension reducing mechanism. You know you just have to have one more and you find that your drinking habits are changing, you're smoking too much. Some people start to eat too much, start to gain weight; poking their head in that refrigerator all the time. They're looking for something to eat, because the ingestion of food is a very effective soporific or a fine tranquilizer for many people. Some people lose their appetite, just the opposite reaction. They can't eat because they're experiencing nausea or they aren't hungry. That is part of the general denial mechanism when it happens that way. Eating is a pleasant experience, they just don't feel that pleasant, they just don't feel that good about things.

Some of the emotional signs that people experience are characterized by a short fuse. You're pretty easy going person, but suddenly you find yourself with a hair trigger, excessive irritability. Sometimes it only reflects itself with close associates and family. Your family starts catching hell because something is going wrong somewhere else and you can't say anything about it and can't do anything about it; and sometimes the family doesn't understand what in the world is happening, but that's the only place where you feel free somehow to let go. That old song, "we only hurt the ones we love," can be true. You find that your irritability level is up and Lord help the poor dog. The sensitive wife sometimes can tell what's going on by the way the car door slams.

There are a number of key signs that a person should know, and to which the spouse should be alerted. They tell you that things are not right and you really need to know yourself well in order to function with that. Also, the inability

to relax frequently is one of the classic signs of tension and anxiety, as is an increased level of activity, but generally aimless activity. You find yourself feeling driven: you're wandering around, you don't know what to do, you don't know how to latch onto something; you're just driven, you can't turn it off and relax. At the same time you find that in terms of thought processes you can't leave the job at the office. You find yourself ruminating about what's going on. It prevents you from going to sleep at night or to wake up, you find yourself obsessed about problems that you really can't do anything about, but you can't let them go. If you find yourself ruminating about the job, and you can't relax, then you're under pressure, you're under tension, and it's time to do something—it may very well be past time to do something.

The denial mechanism is very strong and particularly strong in people who have a strong drive for success and for whom stress sometimes is a sign of the possibility of impending failure. You're not coming up to your expectations or the expectations of others. The fact is, you can't handle everything, it's simply not possible. It's an unrealistic expectation to think that you should be able to handle everything. You are going to be tense, you are going to be anxious—it's normal. Sometimes we over-psychologize and think that there is something wrong with experiencing tension, anxiety, and fear. Those are very important motivating forces. If they are understood well, they can allow you to get yourself together and really address the issue at hand in a realistic way. If you don't understand that you do have some tension and anxiety about something, you're really not going to deal with it realistically; you'll miss parts of the situation. Sometimes we know we're bothered, but we don't know what's bothering us; we don't know where it's coming from. This is part of the whole denial process.

Frequently, someone asks, "Are you angry?" "No," you answer, and yet you're boiling underneath, but you're fearful of admitting that you're upset. If you do not permit yourself to become angry, it creates unusual expectations of the people around you. They think because you don't get angry with all that pressure and stress that they shouldn't, and that it's somehow wrong for them to feel. It's important for you to let those feelings out. Those feelings are affecting other people and for that reason I think we have a responsibility to help them understand what is going on inside of people. If you're going around saying you're not angry and they know you're angry, it creates a very unreal situation and only adds to the stress. It's much better to admit it, to let it hang out a little bit, get it over with, and get on. Hostility is not always negative; it can be a very healthy thing to feel. Anything worth being upset about is worth talking about. If you're not going to talk about it, forget it.

One of the problems we have is that sometimes we don't want to dump it all on our families, particularly after a long period of stress during which the family has experienced a lot of negative feelings about the presidency. We don't want to go home and dump more problems on them. There has to be more than just negative feelings. If you're in a negative situation, the family has to see some positive effects. You have a responsibility as presidents and presidents' wives to make sure that your families are getting some rewards.

It is important for the president and the president's wife to have someone to talk to. Being president is a very lonely job. People don't expect presidents to become upset or to have a need to talk about it; and there aren't that many people (because we tend to be a little bit paranoid sometimes) whom presidents can trust. We assume we can trust our spouses, but whom beyond that? Whom do we talk to when it gets rough? Any good theraphy counselor will tell you that the way to test reality is to throw out your thoughts and get some reflection back from other people. If you play with it yourself, you're going to get caught in your own traps; you've got to talk to somebody about it. There's nothing wrong with talking with a psychiatrist or psychologist or a marriage counselor. People under stress have a normal need to do that.

There is a very serious problem, though, that you are going to face: you might run into some role problems in dealing with individuals professionally in the business of helping. They too may stand in awe of the president and may not be able to be totally objective; I've seen this happen, and they can't always help. You've got to shop around a bit, and if you know someone who has particular expertise in dealing with executive stress and the executive family, those are the people to whom you go. You have to find someone who cares about you as a person, and who doesn't care about your job or your status. One of the real safety valves for the president, and his or her family, is to talk to someone who will let you be a person, who will let you kick off your shoes, lean back, let it all hang out, and it goes no further than that. Someone with whom you do not have to live up to a lot of expectations that are excessively demanding.

You've got to be able to take those robes off and leave them at the office. If you go home wearing some of that officiousness and executive mentality, you're in trouble. However, the family must remember that the husband or the father, or the wife or the mother is the president, and that is a reality favor. In my years of working with people I've treated a number of engineers, and engineers sometimes have particular difficulties. Engineers have a tendency sometimes to be too exact; there's a difference between the right response and the most appropriate response, a very real difference. What works in the executive suite

won't always work at home. That's not the kind of relationship you have and its terribly important to remember that when dealing with the family.

The family must remember that they aren't always going to see the president coming home at his or her best. After you've been tough and strong all day, sometimes you want to let down; adults still have a need to be dependent. If you can exercise that dependency for awhile, it can become easier to meet demands which at other times may be unbearable. I think it's terribly important for the family to let the person who has to wear those robes outside take them off and be something else: kid around, horse around, be silly. It's very therapeutic and useful to do that—a real stress reliever.

It also is important for the family to be aware of what is happening because circumstances may arise which directly affect family members. This certainly was true in our case. We went through a period when our lives were threatened and we were under a security guard. We did not want to inhibit our children's lives, but they had to be aware of the fact that they should be careful; and they did handle it well.

Less dramatic, but still difficult for a family to deal with, is the adverse publicity that may be encountered. This can generate remarks from school friends, even remarks from merchants in the community. It can be devastating for a family to deal with. As parents, you've got to be sure of your own values, of your family solidarity, and you've got to know who you are.

One thing that has stood me in good stead through rough times is that I know who I am. It is terribly important that you don't let other people define you; you have to define yourself. Of course, you're concerned and interested in what people think about you, but in the final analysis, you must know and like yourself. This is basic protection against personal attacks which do not reflect who and what you are. Before I came to California I saw myself as a "John Gardner liberal." Since then, I've seen myself being painted as an arch conservative and a reactionary, and I don't believe those labels because I know who I am. During the turmoil at the beginning of the decade, many students challenged the values we had; and for the most part we listened, but we didn't dump our values over night. If there was some new information worth looking at we looked at it, but we didn't suddenly feel guilty about the kind of world we had worked so hard to create. We believed in ourselves and held on, not in a narrow way, but we didn't change unless there was sufficient reason to change. That's because we had a sense of validity and authenticity.

One of the real challenges of the presidency is learning to live with ambiguity. One day a person says that you have too much power, you abuse it; and the next day they're in your office saying, "Why don't you do something about this—you have the power to change it." In dealing with ambiguity it is important to be consistent. If you find yourself behaving one way one time and another way the next time, you're headed for trouble. People may not like what you do, but they'll respect you for being consistent. You've got to have respect to survive, and you won't have it if you're inconsistent.

Another self-preservation technique is maintaining a good physical condition. If your energy level is low, if you have some illnesses which you're not treating very well, you're not going to be able to deal with the tension and stress when it comes. The adaptive mechanisms of the body simply can't handle the stress that is often related to physical problems as well as the stress of emotional problems. In tandem, they literally will blow you apart. You have to stay reasonably lean trim. I just lost 25 pounds and I'm going to lose some more. I decided to change my image: at one time I saw myself as a nice old teddy bear, now I'm going to be lean and mean. The presidency is a strong consumer of energy and you've got to have some reserves. If you're in meeting after meeting, day after day, or too long into the night, you're not going to make it without those reserves. You can't start the next day tired. After awhile you begin making mistakes and when that happens you start feeling irritable and you don't handle it well. You have to get your rest, you have to stay in reasonably good physical condition, and you have to learn to say no.

We've been described in some respects as the new "slave class" in society because we're slave to everyone. You better get some time for yourself and some privacy. We don't have a state-owned house, we own our own home. At one-time I resented that, now I love it. That's my house, if I don't want anybody in there, they don't get in. I think that kind of privacy is terribly important.

One of the things that I discovered in the past six months is very important: when you no longer have a need to be the president, then maybe you can be the kind of president that you really want to be; you no longer are driven to compromise yourself to be something. As an analogue, once you have the freedom not to be, then you can be. Once you're no longer afraid of dying, then you can live. I'm convinced now that I can do a lot of things other than being president. When I was growing up I worked in steel mills, and I think that if that's what I had to do to make a living, I could do it again, because what I do for a living is not me. The presidency is not me, I know that. If the presidency is you, if that's your identity, you're in trouble. You must make sure that you maintain a sense of

competency becomes diminished. You can't solve any problems if your sense of competency is threatened. You must have something that you know you can do well, and you must do it once and awhile. This is not to say that you shouldn't have a total commitment to the job (the board has a right to expect a full-time president), but it isn't going to hurt you once and awhile to do some of the things that you used to do: scholarly activities, occasional consulting jobs, etc.

I went to Montana about four weeks ago for three days on a consulting job and I came back nine feet tall, because I did what I do very well, and I can do it better than I used to do it. I became more assured, and then thought, "I don't have to be president. If it gets rough, there are a lot of other things I can do and do well." I remembered everything else that I am, and it is terribly important to the all-consuming nature of the job to remember everything else that you are. The family also has to see you in other kinds of roles because it may be distressing to a family to see *the husband or wife who is a president constantly attacked* as to competency. They should know that there are other things that you are and that you can do.

Another prescription is remember your sense of humor: don't take yourself so seriously that you can't laugh. I know I caught myself many times being so serious about everything that I forgot how to smile, I forgot how to kid. Don't forget to laugh at yourself because you get trapped in very incongruous situations a dozen times a day where you can make a fool of yourself if you take it all seriously. Never forget how to admit that you made a mistake, apologize for it, laugh at yourself, and then get on with it.

Finally, one of the things that has helped me, outside of my wife and my good family, is the thing that I would urge all of us to do for each other. Frequently when things have gotten tough for me, and the other presidents in the state have known about it, good people have picked up the phone and called me and said, "How are you doing?" We have a responsibility to do that for our colleagues. We're all in it together and we're in it because I think we are committed to higher education and what it stands for. We have a responsibility to support one another. Pick up that phone or drop somebody a note. It is very important to know that somebody else out there is thinking about you and you're not in it all by yourself.

Remaining an Academic Leader and Being President

Arliss L. Roaden
President
Tennessee Technological University

At the 1976 annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, President James Robinson, of the University of West Florida commented in one of the sessions that expectations of college and university presidents are so unreasonable that they are expected to know "where every sparrow falleth" on campus. A president sitting next to me whispered, "They are more likely to know where every pigeon droppeth."

Whichever the case may be, a falling sparrow or a dropping pigeon, the things that don't show up in a president's job description are legion and those are the things which very early force the ordering of the president's life either in directions toward or away from academic leadership. When those pressures of competing demands converge on the president (you know the litany as well as I) one can sort through them and attend first to those which promise to contribute toward the achievement of a sound academic enterprise or one can become philosophic and conclude "that's all a part of the job."

I shall not be so presumptious in this paper as to propose that there exists a recipe for academic leadership, nor so braggadocious as to convey that I, personally, have arrived at the goal line of this march to academic Zion. The most which any of us can claim is that the march is on.

Although the pattern does not seem to be as clear today as it was a few years ago, in general, the path to academic leadership continues to lead through a success record in academic pursuits. Ann Roe, in her stimulating book, The Making of a Scientist (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1952), identified 64 persons whom she classified as "most eminent scientists." Her objective was to study the background and career development of these "most eminent scientist" to see if there were characteristics which they held in common that might be useful in the preparation and nurturance of future generations of scientists. Thirteen years later, she reported in a paper titled "Change in Scientific Activities

with Age" (Science, Vol. 150, 15 Oct., 1965) that 54 of the original 64 scientists were still living, but that, surprisingly, 53 of the 54 had assumed administrative positions. Most were in colleges and universities; and some had become presidents.

In addition to records of academic performance, the contemporary presidents of colleges and universities typically have filled other academic leadership posts, e.g., chairpersons and deans, in colleges and universities.

The ladder to academic leadership typically is not a ladder at all but a path through academia with a natural incline that sometimes leads to the presidency. The challenge is not for the president suddenly to become an academic leader but to remain an academic leader in the midst of competing pressures and demands. These pressures and demands are not unique to the presidency, but they are the most visible and take their greatest toll in that office. A few years ago, when I was a graduate dean, I published a paper on the college deanship in which I bemoaned the emerging middle management tasks which were inhibiting academic leadership possibilities in those roles (Theory Into Practice, Oct., 1970). I cited with professional embarrassment John Ciardi's caustic description of "the deanly condition" which he titled "To The Damnation of Deans (A Prejudice). "(Saturday Review, 24 March, 1962.) He wrote:

The deanly condition is the condition of ignorance camouflaged by secretaries, charts, IBM cards, and statistics, but ignorance is occupational. Let a good man be trapped into a dean's swivel chair and his inhumane ignorance grows upon him as a condition of his employment. The only real difference between the arrogant and the apologetic deans is that the apologetic ones know to what extent their work drains them of mentality. How can one leave educational decisions to men who lack the time to read a book?

I cited, also, Earl McGrath's admonition that:

Unless the dean frees himself from the routine chores of his office . . . and reserves some free time for study and reflection on the purposes and the program of the academic body over which he presides, his decisions must inevitably be superficial, uninformed, and often inconsistent. Unless he also has a clear view of his inescapable responsibility for program development and the courage to advocate his considered views concerning the policies which shape the institution's purpose and program, these policies will be determined by powerful special-interest groups outside and inside the institution . . . . ("Forward " in J. Gould's The Academic Deanship. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1964.)

In a survey of academic deans, J. Gould reported that most of the deans believe that "increasing numbers of administrative chores are driving scholarly people out of the deanship." Some thought it more likely that the chores were driving scholarship out of the deans. A few thought that scholarly persons tended to avoid the deanship and, hence, were not there to be driven out. (In Arthur J. Dibden, ed., The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1968.)

Although there is no small amount of cynicism associated with academic leadership posts and the debilitating pressures associated with those positions, the problems are for real, particularly so in the presidency. And, tragically, these conditions can be found up and down the academic organization. There is no reassurance in the knowledge that the forfeiture of academic leadership is possible at all levels of academic leadership; that possibility only heightens the severity of the problem. When you are ill, there is small comfort in the knowledge that an epidemic is rampant.

I don't want to exaggerate the occupational deterrents to academic leadership; obviously, all presidents would not launch out on creative academic leadership if they but had the time. The lack of time is not the sole deterrent. There may be some truth to Ciardi's observation that inhumane ignorance grows as a condition of one's employment when he or she becomes trapped in a swivel chair. Such a condition can erode the dreams and aspirations of the best minds. It could become routine to conclude that it is easier to cut programs than to add or improve, easier to look back than to look forward, easier to make rules than to make plans, and easier to dread than to dream.

A first rule for academic leadership is that the leaders not get caught up in institutional pessimism. You don't have to work at it; you just slip into a pessimistic frame of mind. Invitations to pessimism are all around us. Clark Kerr recited in a speech the titles of some higher education books on his bookshelves. I was prompted to check my own library. Here are some examples: Predicament of the University; The Voiceless University; The Campus War; Campus in Crisis; and The College Presidency: Initiation Into The Order of The Turtle.

And on it goes. A litany of doom and despair. A few months ago, I spoke at a meeting which had as its theme "Learning to Live with Less." I couldn't help but think of an inflexible business officer I used to know whose name was Les; his favorite theme was, "it can't be done." Since I never learned to live with him, I concluded that "learning to live with less" is not a worthy objective. It's not an objective at all; it's a condition. As for me, if because of financial

exigencies I have only one program to give, I'll give it with style, rather than dissipate energies at the funerals of those programs which had to go.

I'm concerned not just about the pessimistic literature we write about ourselves; those volumes will pass away. I'm even more concerned about our preoccupation with management techniques. A book published last year by the Carnegie Council caught my eye—until I read it. It was titled, Presidents Confront Reality: From Edifice Complex to University Without Walls. It covered the full range of all-too-familiar topics: enrollment patterns, expenditures per student, the trend toward vocationalism, personnel policies, new markets, new products, reorganization, management information systems, shifts in authority, et al.

Whatever happened, I wondered after reading the book, to the Alfred North Whiteheads whose reflections on education dealt with the human soul, humanitarianism, freedom, truth, and beauty? Or to the Loren Eisleys who wrote about the flow of the river, man of the future, and the secret of life? Or to the Henry Steel Commagers who without equivocation are prepared to assert that our schools have kept us free? Are those concerns gone forever in deference to cost analyses, management techniques, or the presumed nirvana of administrative reorganization? I hope not.

Not long before Robert Hutchins' death, Eric Severeid interviewed him on television. Severeid asked Hutchins about his presidency of the University of Chicago. Dr. Hutchins observed that it was difficult to serve as a university president during the depression in the 1930's. Severeid asked, "What about now? Aren't those jobs impossible today?" Hutchins replied, "Oh, no; they are excellent jobs; excellent provided you don't care anything about education. If you care about education, then the jobs are impossible ones."

I remain hopeful that Hutchins overstated the case, and in the spirit of that fond hope I shall advance some thoughts on academic leadership as the art of the possible for those who cares.

I am proposing that if a president is to remain an academic leader, he or she might consider: leading by example, leading with a positive frame of mind, and leading in the thinking about academic developments and refinements on campus.

If one accepts, as a president must, that the fundamental purpose of colleges and universities is to foster scholarly inquiry and cultural enrichment, then the most effective mode of attaining the fundamental purpose is by doing it—leading by example. A president, if he or she is to remain an academic leader, should remain

active as an academic scholar. A president who finds no time for scholarly pursuits can ill afford to admonish administrative associates and faculty members who find no time for scholarship. They, too, are busy. When academic leaders get too busy to be scholarly, then they have lost their lease on academic leadership. The institution becomes one where everyone is harassed trying to hold it together, and the sense of academic mission has been forfeited. I am not proposing that a president be a part-time president; rather, that a part of the president's time be given to scholarly matters. Reading a journal, writing a paper, or consulting with associates in the laboratory have to be viewed with the same degree of legitimacy and importance as lobbying for the university. These tasks are part of the job of the president; they are not extramural tasks.

I know the arguments to the contrary. When I decided to accept the presidency of my University, my friends, some with alarm, asked, "Why?" Why would anyone leave a tenured professorship and an excellent position of leadership in graduate education and research? One associate took me aside and inquired if there were a serious illness which required my moving to a different climate for medicinal purposes. Another friend sent me a description of expectations for the presidency which a presidential search committee chairman at Yale conveyed to a group of Yale alumni. Among those qualifications were the following:

He must be a great personality, by which is meant one who commands respect, who soothes the ruffled and charms the sentimental—an Olympian who is one of the boys without affectation or jocularity. He must have intimate knowledge of all of the University's colleges, schools, departments, institutes, libraries, museums, and special projects and know how to administer them efficiently and economically; delegating authority while keeping his finger on every pulse and in every pie. He must be a man with a heart who will share the private joys and sorrows of his family. Above all, he must be a leader—leading toward money. Morning, noon, and night he must get money—money for salaries, money for buildings, money for scholarships, money for new projects that will prove he is dynamic. Since his job takes 18 hours a day, 7 days a week, 11 months a year, his health must be good—no colds, no ulcers, no slipped discs. Finally, his wife must be a combination of Queen Victoria, Florence Nightingale, and the Best Dressed Woman of the Year.

Another friend warned me that a thick bibliography "cuts no ice with the Board and the Legislature; they want only a balanced budget and no audit exceptions."

All of this folklore about the presidency is amusing—if we don't start believing it and behaving as if it were true. We often misjudge expectations of the presi-

dency. When all is said and done, constituents of the institution and the general public expect the president to be an academic leader—leading to high quality programs. Morning, noon, and night, the president is expected to lead toward new knowledge, improved teaching, accredited programs, and intellectual credibility of the graduates. If every speech which the president makes and every message he or she transmits deal only with the budget, the buildings, and the organizational structure, then very soon, everyone assumes that those are the only aspects of Univeristy life which the president considers to be of sufficient importance to deal with.

Last year, a president reported his great delight when a professor in his discipline invited him to lecture in his classes. When the president asked what block of content he would like to have included in the lectures, the professor responded, "Oh, I don't want you to worry about any content, just come and answer questions about the operation of the University." The president quite appropriately declined the invitation.

I am convinced that there are opportunities for academic leadership in the presidency which are not apparent in other roles. That conviction stops short of a messianic complex calling for the educational salvation of society, but I believe in the possibilities with sufficient zeal to recommend that presidents are justified to "go out into the byways and hedges and compel them (students) to come in." Perhaps the objective phrased by John Amos Comenius in 1632 is now achievable; "Let the main object," he said, "be to seek and to find a method of instruction by which teachers may teach less, but learners learn more; by which the schools may be the scene of less noise, aversion, and useless labor, but of more leisure, enjoyment, and solid progress."

The problem of the president's remaining an active scholar was dramatized by the story of David Starr Jordan who, when he became president of Stanford in 1891, had established an international reputation for his encyclopedic knowledge of fish, their names, and classification. He determined that he would also come to know each student by name. Several years later, President Jordan reported that he had given up: "I found that every time I learned the name of a student, I forgot the name of a fish." (Change, August, 1977.)

Granted, the challenge to remain active as a scholar is difficult to achieve. I am, nevertheless, convinced that a president who loses his scholarship will in the long run create a presidency where scholarship may neither be needed nor wanted—not a very exciting legacy for future generations. There are, to be sure, many worthy things which compete for the president's time. Those we ought to

do, but not neglect the weightier matters of academia—academic leadership.

I commented earlier about the debilitating aspects of institutional pessimism. Let me elaborate. I was struck by President Roland Dille's comments about the wages of unionization in the concluding paragraph of his memorandum (AASCU memo, July 21, 1977). Commenting to his faculty, he said, "Now, we can simply accept this and serve as bureaucratic managers of uninspired and uninspiring labor forces whose tasks are deemed less and less worthy of praise and support. It may be nothing can be done about it. But I think that we ought to do some thinking and a good deal of talking about it."

Yes, I concur. We all need to do a lot of thinking and talking about this condition.

Higher education literature is replete with descriptions of steady state and management by retrenchment. I am weary of the terms. There is nothing steady about a university or college. They are in perpetual motion. You can't sit on them and hold them steady, nor can you retrench and hold the line. Yes, I know about demographic projections of student enrollment and attendant resources from enrollment-driven formulae. I know also that if a president ever loses faith in the basic health and vitality of the institution, then despair sets in throughout the organism. There are academic vital signs of far greater importance than just counting students and studying appropriation charts.

Faith is not blind faith; if it's real it is visionary faith. I derive a lot of comfort from the report of Arthur D. Little's faith. Around 1920, Little, who headed up the giant pharmaceutical firm, grew tired of hearing the comment, "you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." It seemed to him that too many people accepted the defeatist attitude that there are certain things you can't do. That attitude was manifested through the observation, "You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." "Who can't?" Little challenged. Then he proceeded to spend thousands of dollars on proving it could be done. A Chicago meat packing firm provided one hundred pounds of ears which were reduced to a glue and then, through various chemical operations, were turned into a kind of silk which was handwoven into a purse. That silk purse from a sow's ear is reported to be on exhibit in the Smithsonian Institute along with Lindberg's airplane and John Glenn's space capsule. Arthur D. Little never viewed his achievement as being anything extraordinary in chemistry but he did view it as an extraordinary accomplishment in philosophy, to change the attitudes of people who claimed that certain things could not be done.

Edgar Dale, who is still an outstanding scholar as an octogenarian, wrote a letter to me in which he said that if I hadn't yet adopted a motto for the University, he would like to suggest one. He sent the famous lines of architect, city engineer, Daniel H. Burnham who designed the city of Chicago around the turn of the Century. Those lines are: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably, themselves, will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone, will be a living thing ascertaining itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and your beacon, beauty."

I may be bold enough to adopt the motto. I like Christopher Morley's advice: "Do every day something no one else would be silly enough to do."

Presidents can, without very much effort, either isolate themselves from academic planning on campus or be effectively isolated by others who legitimately are concerned about protecting the president's calendar. On the "leadership by example" theme, presidents set examples by what things they think and talk about, with whom they share their thoughts, to what groups they speak, and about what.

Far too frequently, a new president (and sometimes an older president) becomes preoccupied with institutional organization and reorganization. That is a good way to get people's attention in a hurry. With predictable consistency, popular and professional media report that "New President Reorganizes State U." Many people are waiting for the shoes to drop. What things are going to be changed? (Which means who is going to be changed?) There is a natural curiosity throughout the institution and the community about "what's going to happen to whom;" and there is no absence of gossip about who shall be on the left hand and who on the right.

My advice (which is rarely heeded) is to avoid getting caught up in that drama. Some will say that the president lacks fortitude; the kinder ones will say he or she is too nice to be president. Nevertheless, any institution is headed toward trouble when there is a high state of anxiety among those charged with leadership responsibilities. Presidents should immediately reassure those who need reassurance and help those who need help. The president can't do his or her job unless staff members are doing theirs; and they can't function effectively if they are kept off-balance.

One recurring theme in the literature which is worthy of attention is staff development. For psychological health, every person in a college or university must believe that he or she is important in achieving the fundamental purpose of the institution—the generation of knowledge and cultural enrichment. The best way for that to happen is to start shifting everyone's attention in those directions.

The president, in regular meetings with academic and administrative staff members, should be sure that the agenda is not burdened with fiscal, management, and structural matters. Rather, the assembly should think, talk, and breathe academic topics. Where are we strong? Where are we weak? What programs need to be developed or refined?

Yes, there is just so much time available to a president. The key to time management is not so much a decision about what not to do or who not to see. Rather, it is a decision about agenda topics—what you think about and what you talk about. The president typically is scheduled to speak to many audiences—ceremonial welcomes to visiting groups on campus, church congregations, chambers of commerce, service clubs, faculty groups, student groups, alumni, commencements, and national, state, and local academic and professional assemblies. What a rare opportunity to ensure that at least some of the content of those speeches deal with academic matters!

Even in private conferences with students, faculty members, and staff members about topics of importance to them—the quality of dorm life, parking facilities, salaries, rank, and tenure—some discussion can and should be directed toward the quality of the academic enterprise.

I've offered a lot of advice for "remaining academic leaders." My advice may turn out to be like that of the Guru who advised the peasant farmer on things to do to stop his chickens from dying. After several desperation trips to the Guru and after receiving many solutions to the problem, the farmer came back, finally, and reported, "Oh, Master, all my chickens are dead." "Tis too bad," the Guru responded, "I had so many more solutions to offer." (Quoted in New Directions for Higher Education," Number 12, Winter, 1976.)

Of all the pressures and challenges facing the contemporary president, none are greater than the pressure and challenge to succeed. Success in any area that does not result in academic leadership will be a hollow success at best.

Henry Wriston is said to have reported that he never felt successful as a college president at Brown until he got to the point that he could go through the day

without reading his mail. With that as a criterion, I can report whopping success. With some expenditure of time in the library, I hope, desperately, that more of my mail will read like the letter one president received from a professor who sent a copy of his recently published journal article. He wrote: "Please accept this as my contribution, however feeble, to your vision of the University—a vision which I share and draw inspiration from."

Role of the Chief Executive in Institutional Self-Renewal

John A. Marvel
President
Consortium of State Colleges and Universities of Colorado

The title of this paper infers some basic assumptions:

1) That the institution has an optimum vitality.

2) That the institution needs periodic revitalization, recommitment, reaffirmation or renewal.

3) That the President has the role and ability to lead the institution in this renewal process and to realign the institutional profile in terms of goals and programs.

As an experienced administrator, you have your own ideas on dealing with the constant challenge of keeping the academic community close to its primary commitment. All of you are engaged or soon will be involved in taking your institutions through such a process. The search process used in your selection was set on the reaffirmation of institutional goals. Regardless of the pro forma inherent in such a process, it represented a serious attempt by the institution to restate its basic purposes.

Your acceptance of the position signalled the initiation of the self-renewal process, the search for a new consensus—a new community. Aside from the inaugural protocol, the realignment of an academic socio-gram and the institutional politics, you have or will discover a reception for looking anew at the institution and, despite possibly conflicting expectations, some new concepts about the institution and its current status will evolve.

Don't underestimate the impact of the new chief executive in providing fresh enthusiasm for new, as well as old, purposes. A new broom not only sweeps clean, it also can sweep the lint of prejudice out of the corners of the academic community. One should not miss the opportunity to capture a new community

spirit, the opportunity to build the basic elements—communication, participation, and understanding. These elements evolve from the opportunity to respond and react.

Let's assume that a viable community spirit has been developed. Let's also assume that the president is enjoying reasonable success in building a consensus on priorities and a commitment to pursue them. How then, does the president avoid the quick-bloom-fast fade syndrome? How can institutional self-renewal be perpetuated?

To begin with, such self-renewal can be sustained by sensitive organizational structure. I am reluctant to introduce structural issues before substantive issues are addressed, but it is essential to provide access to the design and operation processes of the institutions in order to avoid power plays and needless academic fencing over campus politics. The provision of a structure which solicits participation from all representative groups in our constituency is extremely important. The academic community is notorious for panning committee work, but to deny the opportunity to engage in shaping institutional policies creates anxieties which crack the very foundation of academic freedom.

The nature of organizational structure speaks to individual management styles. The recognition of a balance between old guard and new guard are indices of both confidence and respect. Your actions, after thoughful study, usually will be accepted, but early in the testing of the administrative philosophy, there may be some game playing to discern the sincerity of faculty voice. All may not wish to participate, but all will demand the right to be heard. While some may classify the academic community as an anarchy and others as a protective kingdom, we can still do no less than afford representative participation, with the understanding that our delegation of responsibility is not abdication of authority.

Structure must be flexible and responsive. Whatever is educationally sound should be administratively possible. We must guard against an organization that kills the spirit that built it. That common disease, "lack of communications," can be rendered ineffective with a sensitive organizational structure which involves representatives from all campus and supporting constituents.

A viable institutional plan also is important to sustaining self-renewal. We all readily acknowledge that developing an institutional master plan is a rigorous activity. If we are to meet the major objective of improving the educational process, we must avoid reviewing a parade of academic disciplines. Rather, we must require each faculty member to review his or her own actions in light of

institutional objectives. We also would agree that master planning is not a blueprint for the ideal institution or utopian campus, but that an exciting academic community can be built with motivated people who have a sense of what a human institution should be. Everyone is defining the institution, so let us define it for others.

Planning, thus, should be used as an instrument of enlightenment rather than an academic chastity belt. To create a living master plan, we must establish a sense of movement and mission. The plan must also be sufficiently stable to sustain the idea which gave it birth and sufficiently responsive to remain relevant to the constituents who support it.

The master plan must be searching and must stimulate thought if it is to avoid the too-common "paralysis from analysis." Much like the U.S. Constitution, we do not place our hands on the master plan each morning or read its preamble to the faculty. The master plan may not be known in every detail by the members of the academic community, but its existence is as important as its substance, because they believe in it.

To be successful a master plan must be kept alive, well, and dust-free. It should have some relevance to what we are doing in the offices and classrooms and be manageable within the resources and ongoing activities of the institution. The planning effort should help to make each member of the academic community a student of the institution in particular and higher education in general. If the plan is sound in facts, it will excite the faculty. If it is immediate in impact, it will excite the students. It will remain a viable instrument for meeting identifiable needs.

A Continuous Evaluation Process also is important to self-renewal. I am an advocate of annual reviews of master plans to express the ambitions of the planners, to set out why an institutional plan was built in the first place—to affirm and commit. There is need for periodic assessments of our institutional efforts, an occasional academic garage sale to rid ourselves of negative attitudes and false information or assumptions. Such reviews also permit us to examine our major and minor achievements as well as our perennial stresses—to see how the institution is coping with the ripples on the academic waters about access, cost accountability, quality, and role relationships.

How do we use evaluation in this renewal process? How do we get others to do those things that should be done because they want to do them? The right system is the one that works—what has been successful for you. Evaluation deals less

with calendar and more with clarity. Evaluation calls for a better definition of quality. Evaluation is like experimentation—it may not be the ultimate answer, but it makes one use his best efforts in looking for answers. Individuals and groups are constantly evaluating us, so let's direct their viewing. Evaluation has to have a method of approach and control. Evaluation looks behind platitudes and images.

One method that encourages participation in the evaluation process is the institutional seminar. Such seminars provide an in-depth probe into topics which come from several sources: annual reports, faculty sensitivity sessions, and academic and administrative councils. Priorities are established at the end of the academic year with input from the administrative and faculty councils. Papers and discussions are presented on such topics as: fiscal conditions, faculty development, fund raising programs, enrichment approaches, redevelopment of resources, images of the institution, institutional uniqueness, personalized approach to teaching, creation of new options, organizational structure, collective bargaining, and evaluation of professional performance.

Another technique that seems to get results is the annual evaluation with administrative and academic officials, with annual reports to internal and external publics providing the basis for discussion.

Outside consultants are more effective if they are invited by the institution. Evaluations not only reveal the boulders in our paths, but examine the sand in our shoes. They serve as reality therapy to keep the institution looking more at facts than at folklore. State-wide issues are co-mingled with local concerns, so as not to be completely absorbed in distant or parochial problems. Regular evaluation processes provide stability to an academic community during protracted periods of restrictive budgets, state-wide policy limitations, depressed enrollment patterns and intense competition. Evaluation also provides avenues for release of anxieties and ambitions, diminishes actions of special interest groups, and helps us to act on what is known.

If we continue to re-examine our reason for being, to re-evaluate our purposes, and to re-structure our programs to fulfill our new commitments, we will not be ready for a move, nor will our institution be pushing for a change in leadership. We all need to check our ability to remain sensitive enough to the attitudinal profile of our institution to know if our leadership is still having a salutary effect on the overall effectiveness of the educational program.

What indices can one use to assess leadership effectiveness in maintaining institu-

tional self-renewal? Self-monitoring is the key to coping. We must monitor our successes and stresses and our reaction to them. There is no magic year when administration leadership begins to wane. The best barometer is built in oneself—the vibrations we get from others and from ourselves. How can we keep the inaugural spirit alive? How do we prevent pre-mature administrative rigor mortis? Self-renewal and institutional renewal are highly correlated. "As goes the man, so goes the institution," and the following questions may help us evaluate ourselves and our institutions:

An Unscientific Self-Inflicted Evaluation Instrument

1. Is renewal aimed at institutional purposes or individual or departmental gains?

2. Is the institution trying too much and accomplishing too little?

3. Does a spirit of candor still prevail within an atmosphere of mutual trust?

4. Is the institution auditing its own progress by maintaining a self-monitoring system?

5. Has the institution polarized around anxieties or has it withdrawn from reality?

6. Has accomplishment become a destiny or a journey?

7. Can you advance your own thoughts in a convincing manner without discouraging openness and challenge?

8. Are you beginning to justify "what you have done" more than "what needs doing"?

9. Are you professionally stimulated by your co-workers?

10. Are you a student of your own tasks by bringing new approaches and new information to your job?

As long as you can answer all these questions with what you consider to be the correct responses, you will still enjoy more curtain calls. If you answer between 7 to 9 correctly, you may have another encore, but if you respond correctly to 6 or less, perhaps you should exercise your options before it's curtains for you.

On Leadership and Management in American Colleges and Universities

James A. Robinson
President and Professor of Political Science
The University of West Florida

Eric Sevareid: "Operating one (a university) now is just about impossible for anybody."

Robert Hutchins: "Now, I think it probably is—I think, I think, now—of course, if you don't care, if you don't care anything about education, a university presidency is a great job. If, if—I'm serious, if you don't want to, if you don't want to do anything except keep an institution rolling and have a dignified position and access to the press and subsidized housing and automobiles and a good salary, then the university presidency is a great place. But if you want to do something about education—in the first place you'll never be chosen, and in the second place you can't do it"

CBS Television, August 31, 1975

"The world may collapse tomorrow; it may not. The university may survive another ten years; it may not. The differences are important, and the problems are serious. But the outcomes do not much depend on the college president."

Michael D. Cohen and James G. March
Leadership and Ambiquity: The
American College President.
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974, p. 5.

" 'The only power I have,' says Willard L. Boyd, President of the University of Iowa, 'is the power to persuade.' "

The Impossible Job: A Special Report on What it Takes to Run A College These Days. Editorial Projects for Education, 1975, p. 5.

If one takes seriously much of what is said or written by and about college and university officials, many of us live pitifully. Both participants among and observers of the chief executive officers of institutions and systems of higher education, persons who bear such titles as chancellor, president, provost, vice president for academic affairs, or academic dean, testify that the states of their positions are the modernist's substitute for Hobbes' version of the state of nature—"nasty, brutish, and short."

Those who have followed college and university officers in the 1970's know some of the major trends and conditions, many new, others accentuated from the past, that they confront for example:

1. Accountability for use of increasingly substantial public sums (contemporaneous with demands to reduce administrative costs).

2. "Affirmative Action" for admissions and employment of minorities, women, and handicapped (interrupted with changing governmental guidelines about "quotas" and "goals").

3. Alterations in student predispositions about curricula combined with faculty-approved reductions in "required courses" or "distribution requirements," whose existence theretofore had made enrollments within and among courses relatively predictable.

4. Decline of educational priorities on the agenda of Congress and many state legislatures.

5. Enrollment stabilization or diminution.

6. Simultaneous inflation of expenses and recession of incomes, the "energy crisis" being a conspicuous example of the former and a "paper crisis" being a likely successor by the end of the decade.

7. Tax reforms in 1969 affecting charitable gifts virtually coterminous with relatively diminishing support for education by the federal governement.

8. Termination of most of the distinctions between the status of tenured and untenured faculty members.

9. Threatened deceleration of public support for "non-traditional" students.

10. Unionization of faculties and non-faculty staffs just as administrators completed potential cost-savings in personnel positions and in non-personnel categories, only to realize that these labor-intensive institutions continue to allocate 70–80 percent of expenditures to payroll.

Such a decathlon of trends and conditions, varying in impact from campus to campus and system to system, understandingly induced waves of self-abnegating, self-pitying, and self-serving pleas for varying combinations of salvations, inter alia: larger grants to institutions; more governmental aid to students; new compacts between public and private sectors; invention of consortia; search for new clienteles; incentives for early retirement; alternatives to tenured faculty appointments—and uniformly wistful recollections of the previous decade, the halcyon days of the 1960's or the "golden years" that David Henry of the University of Illinois has chronicled. [1]

President-Emeritus Henry, however, recalls that the golden years were not precisely the good old days. His memoir recounts challenges from the period of "growth" fully as disconcerting and conflict-inducing as those of the "steady state," with effects on "quality" perhaps even more severe then than on "quantity" now.

From among the circumstances of the 1960's, one may recall a list of trends and conditions that make the 1970's seem comparatively tolerable:

1. Complaints about introductory undergraduate courses taught by graduate assistants rather than by senior professors.

2. Controversies over the role of university researchers in national policy, especially in defense-related or classified studies.

3. Creation of new specialties (e.g., computer and information sciences), but difficulties in appraising quality of innovators who migrated from established fields of disciplines into emerging fields.

4. Crowded classrooms and/or closed courses.

5. Demonstrations about war and racial injustice.

6. Expansion of old or founding of new institutions, often with relatively poor planning.

7. Inadequate dormitory accommodations.

8. New "life styles" (e.g., about drugs, abolition of in loco parentis, etc.).

9. Rapid growth in enrollments accompanied by keen competition for scarce faculty.

10. Tendency of the federal government to adopt new programs in response to "crises" (e.g., Sputnik).

These indicators of some recent trends of higher education may help put the present into perspective. The practices and studies of collegiate officialdom, like those of any other subject, are in a continual race with problems; the problems change, but so do the opportunities. Educational leaders and managers have, therefore, little reason to pity themselves for circumstances peculiar to the 1970's and the impending 1980's. The major conditions that distinguish the former decade from the one through which we now are passing and into which we are about to enter are the size and character of the clientele we serve. Enrollments virtually tripled in the 1960's; now they are levelling off nationally and have declined or are declining in some institutions. The "expanding state" yields to the "stationary or steady state," or even the "contracting state"; growth gives way to zero-growth or even shrinkage. Nothing gives way to the inevitable: demands for supporting worthy ideas, projects, and goals exceed resources. Hence, we face an agenda of unremitting conflict—ideological, intellectual, inter-group, and inter-personal.

In addition to changes in size, the characteristics of the clientele have changed. More part-time students attend than heretofore; the average age of students has risen; the proportion of minorities and low-income students quickly increased and then levelled or declined.

One consequence of both these major conditions, however different their content, affects the role of senior-level officials in colleges and universities, whether at the campus or multi-campus levels. Presidents, provosts, chancellors, and deans, who typically are educators who entered into administration to advance their academic values, have become preoccupied with virtually anything and everything other than education, the subject that originally qualified them for or induced them into their offices. They deal less frequently with students (notwithstanding the "student revolution") than with rules and regulations that constitute campus administrative or judiciary systems. They participate less often, if at all, in decisions about curricula and faculty personnel than in designing and imple-

menting systems for measuring productivity (notwithstanding the participation of faculty in campus government or the introduction of collective bargaining). Their colleagues assemble data for national surveys, such as those of the American Association of University Professors' annual salary study, the Higher Education General Information Survey, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems studies, or the National Association of College and University Business Officers' inquiries, whose effects sometimes obscure individual institutional characteristics in arrays of data aggregation.

Whether in the expanding state, the steady state, or the contracting state, our jobs have been described emphatically as managerial. We "manage" crises,[2] we "manage" resources, we "manage" personnel, we "manage" information, and we often are accused, accurately, of "managing the news." When we have not been managing, we have been designing management systems, for accountability, affirmative procedures, personnel evaluations, and reporting.

Little wonder polls of observers of higher education reveal few college and university presidents and chancellors among "the leaders" in higher education. Presidents, chancellors, and deans typically have not been leaders, but managers, in recent years. Had a different question been asked in surveys of educators, "Who are the outstanding managers in higher education?" the names of Father Theodore Hesburgh, Representative John Brademas, President Kingman Brewster, and—a possible exception—Dr. Clark Kerr would not likely have topped the list, as they did in a recent survey in Change. Indeed, the managers have been so closely tied to their home institutions or multi-campus urban or state systems that their visibility is likely to have been largely local or regional (Cohen and March, 1974).

Among senior academic administrators, I have distinguished between leader and manager (and, hence, lead[illegible] and management). The burden of my argument is that the 1970's and 1980's require from the chief executive or senior officers of colleges and universities, and of multi-campus systems, greater efforts to "lead" than to "manage."

I do not mean to disparage management, and my experience in communicating this theme to various audiences has taught me to try to clarify and pacify the relationship between these two functions. In my lexicon, leadership cannot do without management. Nor can management have significance, except as an exercise, without leadership.

In the recent past, leadership has been provided by persons outside universities

and from the "bottom" of the university hierarchies. Within any institution, variations in the level at which the different functions of leading and managing are performed may be tolerated or even encouraged, providing both are well performed. A university (or multi-campus system) can enjoy a "manager" as president (or chancellor) and chief executive if the next level includes "leaders," as I define them. Similarly, the chief executive and other officers can lead if they are supported by skilled manager. My impression is that the typical American college, university, or multi-campus system is now administered by successive layers of management-oriented officers rather than alternating levels of leaders and managers.

One must continually be careful of definitions of terms as common as leader and manager. Some influential writers mean by manager what I mean by leader (e.g., Drucker [1974 passim], Levitt [1976]); however, I do not recall anyone who means by leader what I mean by manager. The use of language reinforces one's impression that we have emphasized one important function to the neglect of another.

To lead is to occupy an authoritative position in relation to others within an organization or institution. The significance of leadership's being relational is severalfold. The selection of the leader(s) of collegiate or university institutions and systems depends on others (i.e., constituencies with varying predispositions, perspectives, identifications, expectations, and demands). The success of leaders also depends in part on their mobilizing support among others toward collegiate, university, or system goals. Success also depends on the resources or assets available to the institution or system and the effectiveness with which the membership mobilize these in support of the institutional or systemic goals. That leadership is relational implies that leaders may (and I would argue do and should) bring some assets to the relationship. Ideally, all participants hope that their contributions, joined with those of others, will make a positive difference in the institution's or system's status and development.

If one is to talk about leaders in decision making, the talk is facilitated by adopting an explicit model of the decision process that describes a wide variety of institutions and systems. In what follows, I adopt a model of the decision process familiar to "policy scientists" (Lasswell, 1971, pp. 27-33). I will not argue for this one in preference to others. Because alternative ways of characterizing decision-making are familiar to many, I put some equivalent terms in brackets to facilitate communication among persons with different perspectives. The approach that I outline assumes seven functions or stages (as defined by observers, not necessarily by participants) in the making of decisions:

1. Intelligence, i.e., gathering information [planning; recording; retrieving; searching; storing]

2. Promotional, i.e., recommending alternative courses of action [advocating; building coalitions; cajoling; disseminating; "jawboning"; mobilizing support; motivating; pleading; persuading].

3. Prescription. i.e., selecting an alternative [authorizing; choosing; deciding; decreeing; instructing; ordering; voting].

4. Invocation, i.e., characterizing provisionally a particular event or situation as conforming to or deviating from a prescription [decree; order; precedent; rule; regulation; statute].

5. Application, i.e., entering the final, as distinguished from the provisional, classification of an event or situation in relation to a prescription. [Stages 1, 4, and 5 embrace activities familiar to "management" or "administrative" models, including accounting, auditing, budgeting, controlling, coordinating, inventorying, and staffing, as well as other important and well-known organizational functions].

6. Appraisal, i.e., comparing the prescription's effects with intended goals [auditing; cost-effective analysis; evaluation; experimentation; institutional research].

7. Termination, i.e., discontinuing or revising a prescription on the basis of appraisal [reallocation; retrenchment; "sunset laws"; "zero-based" budgeting].

Every stage of the decision process (whether as characterized in this model or another) involves common or equivalent intellectual tasks for problem solving. These apply to institutions and other various sub-units (e.g., colleges, departments, bureaus, centers, institutes). Implicitly or explicitly, the process of decision involves five kinds of generalized thinking:

1. Goals-setting or explication (What are the institution's or sub-unit's preferred goals or outcomes?).

2. Trends-recording (What is the history of the institution or the sub-unit in attaining its goals?).

3. Conditions-analysis (Why is an institution or sub-unit successful, partially successful, or unsuccessful in attaining its goals?).

4. Projections-making or forecasting (What will be the likely state of affairs with respect to attaining the institution's or sub-unit's goals, assuming present trends and conditions continue to prevail?).

5. Alternatives-invention (What courses of action may be imagined and developed to intercept and alter ill-preferred trends, unsatisfactory conditions, and unattractive projections with a view to advancing more probably the preferred goals of the institution or sub-unit?).

Where do and where should leaders, as distinguished from manager, apply their attention and assets as they participate in making the decisions of their institution or system, and which intellectual tasks or problem-solving functions do and should they emphasize? Because leadership is relational, both empirical and normative answers depend partly on others' performances, including many participants' predispositions and skills, and upon the institution's circumstances and resources. I know virtually nothing about the answers to empirical questions about the ways in which presidents budget their time, but I have some definite impressions. The analyses of presidents' calendars so far undertaken reveal that they devote more time to external, "off-campus," activities than to internal affairs. What little we know seems to tell us the same relationship applies to time periods more than 20 years apart. See Cohen and March (1974, pp. 125-152) and Lasswell (1947; reprinted 1966, p. 281) on ways in which college and university presidents spend their time. It is the off-campus external environment that demands and expects the identification of the "leader" or "manager" from campus.

On the basis of available information, one can venture interpretation and hypothesis: external time is devoted primarily to promoting: advocating, defending, explaining, interpreting, and justifying campus goals and alternatives to legislatures, foundations, individual donors, and other off-campus constituencies. The "feedback effects" of these activities should not be overlooked, however, such time and effort also draw intelligence about the institution, especially perceptions among external constituencies and appraisals by them of the college's or university's or system's performance. Hence, the chief executive serves as an important recipient of external monitoring of the institution or system and thus can contribute data to both the intelligence and appraisal functions of the institution or system.[3]

Topics of annual meetings of national organizations, such as the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, can be taken as indicators of what occupies the focus of attention of representative academic officials at selected cross sections in time.

In terms of the decision process model outlined in this paper and compatible with my usage, I note three major emphases in recent years:

1. Emphasis on the invocation and application stages, e.g., crisis management and financial management.

2. Emphasis on the promotional stage, e.g., survival of institutions; stablization of enrollments; fund-raising and clientele-enlarging (for both public and private sectors).

3. Emphasis on the appraisal stage, e.g., accountability for dollars; "affirmative action" in admissions, retention, and appointments; relatively little on curricula or on educational outcomes.

Evidence for this trend lies in comparing changes in topics for sessions and panels of AASCU's annual meetings of 1969-76, as summarized below:

1969 Theme: Target for the 1970's

"Higher Education for the 1970's"

"State Colleges and Universities in the 1970's"

"The Black Student of the 1970's"

"New Ideas for the 1970's"

"Urban Education for the 1970's"

"International Education for the 1970's"

1970 Theme: Presidential Leadership in the Total Learning Environment

"Job of the President in Assessing and Improving the Teacher-Learning"

"Building Confidence and Support. . ."

"New Initiatives in Advancing State Colleges and Universities"

*Allied Health Professions

*Environment

*International Education

*Urban Education

"Creating an Effective Physical Environment for Learning"

1971 Theme: The Future of State Colleges and Universities

"What should be?"

"How do we get there?"

"Academic Freedom, Responsibilities, Tenure, and Procedure"

"Institution's Rights and Responsibilities"

"Quality and Effectiveness"

1972 Theme: In the Public Interest

Statements on Academic Change and Improvement

*Federal Legislative Action

*Affirmative Action

*Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure

*Federal Involvement in Accreditation

"Trends in Faculty Personnel Practice--Contracts, Tenure, Negotiations, Recent Court Cases"

"Affirmative Action in the Public Interest"

1973 Theme- Leadership Imperatives

Academic Personnel Management

•Legal and Regulatory Issues

•A Model Campus Affirmative Action Program

•Toward a Comprehensive Personnel System

•Collective Bargaining

"Current Federal Developments"

"Accountability in Action"

"Evaluation of Professional Performance"

"Existing Plans"

"Accreditation"

"Campus Governance"

"Effective Utilization of Resources"

"Legal Issues"

"Federal and State Relations"

"Management and Information Systems"

"Innovation and Change. . ."

Time Shortened Degrees

External Degrees

SOC and Transfer Students

New Clienteles

1974 Theme: A World in Transition

Role of the Spouse

Conflict Resolution

Intercollegiate Athletics

Title IX Guidelines

Retrenchment

Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action

1975 Theme: Focus on the Arts

This theme is not consistent with my hypothesis, but within the program there were panels on:

Centralization

Collective Bargaining

Recruitment/Admissions

Federal Scene

Older Students

1976 Theme: Entering the Third Century

"Life Style for Mobility"

"Expectations and Realities for the Future. . . "

•Federal, Staff, Public, Media

"Improving College/Corporate Relations"

"Creating a Climate for Campus Change"

"Challenge: Quality, Quantity, and Accountability"

Other recurring phrases:

new clientele

efficiency and economy

Title IX (athletics)

"Improving Institutional/State Relations"

"How Colleges Can Help State Government"

"The Federal Scene"

In the middle of the 1971 program, one saw the beginnings of the gradual changes from topics closely pertaining to values, i.e., with prescription, appraisal, or alternatives-invention, and more on promotion, application, and invocation. That a counter-trend may be underway was indicated by the theme selected for AASCU's 1977 program: "Leadership Makes the Difference." What I have said about the focus of attention by leaders to various stages of the decision process pertains also to the elements of the intellectual or problem-solving tasks they choose among. I believe that we have not placed enough emphasis on the points of the problem-solving processes at which leaders can appropriately and competently exert leverage. I refer to points at which values are at issue in critical ways.

Consider goal-clarification and goal-setting. Here, if anywhere, the leadership, as distinguished from the managerial, influence should prevail. Pertinent questions include "education for whom?" and "what education for whom?" By contrast, we understandably have been preoccupied with survival for its own sake rather than with survival for substantive purposes. Fortunately, as colleges, universities, and multi-campus systems review and revise institutional and systemic statements of missions, integrity of purpose may be expected to return to the forefront of leaders' concern. These efforts involve issues about values, and they surely fall within the domain of leadership.

Trends. Considerable statistical data are being collected, not ordinarily by leaders personally, of course, and regrettably not necessarily about the goals that leaders most need to know about, unless they make special efforts. Much of the data is

demographic or financial. While the former is in demand by leadership, the latter is essentially managerial except when the chief executive uses, as one should, the budget to implement the leader's and institution's values. In recent years, however, flexibility in the budget has been relatively slight for many chief executives, and this, because it has accentuated conflict without diminishing the ratio of those who "lose," perhaps as much as any other constraint has demeaned the sense of self-satisfaction that "leaders" expect to derive from their work. A leader can be involved in this aspect of problem solving only to the extent of providing data pertinent to his or her and to the institution's or system's preferred values.

Conditions. This too is in the province of someone other than that of the leader. It is my impression, however, that scholarly or scientific research on education—studies of whether and why educational practices do or do not realize institutional objectives—lacks the standing of comparable work with non-educational organizations that it enjoys in other arenas. I note with approbation, however, that the American Psychological Association recently elected a distinguished student of educational methodology as its president. One cannot ignore, on the other hand, that national expenditures for research and development in education are about one-half of one percent of the total educational expenditure, as contrasted with 14% in agriculture and 22% in medicine (Hodgkinson, 1976, p. 29).

Projections. As with trend analyses, the leader should specify the characteristics (e.g., subjects, "time-frame") of the projections he or she requires. These are the prelude to one's active participation in the invention of alternatives consistent with institutional goals, the attainment of which surely is among the chief responsibilities of a leader.

I think it fair to say that the current generation of managerial-minded educational officers has been interested more in marginal than in substantive changes in goals; hence, many of us introduce and accept incremental reforms designed to stave off retrenchment and settle at best for reallocation.

Where should an academic leader apply attention and assets? Certainly the answers depend on the trends and conditions in which an institution or system finds itself at any moment and on its projections. In any circumstance, however, I think the attention and resources of leaders ought to be goal-centered, i.e., value-oriented.

Where are values most relevant? In the decision process, values are exercised by (1) giving direction to planning, i.e., to gathering intelligence about what goals;

(2) appraising the effectiveness (based on trends and conditions) of practices in relation to goals; (3) terminating (or reallocating) resources according to goals. In the intellectual or problem-solving tasks, values predominate in setting and goal-clarification, and in alternatives-invention.

Leadership for what values? It may seem arcane to ask what values educational leaders and their institutions are to serve. Is not education for its own sake our chief goal? Yes and no.

I take for granted variations from campus to campus and acknowledge the existence of major types of institutions, to wit, the differences exemplified among major collectivities of institutions, such as the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC); American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU); Association of American Universities (AAU); American Association of Colleges (AAC); and National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU).

The "core sector" (Parsons and Platt, 1973) is enlightenment research and its diffusion through degrees, courses, non-credit offerings, extension, "continuing education," and public service). If the core sector is the basic research and development of higher education, its outcomes, however, affect other values. For example, "skill." Consider the dependence of vocational and technical training institutes on colleges and universities, or the proliferation of "in-house" industrial or military training on university R & D data processing firms that train their employees to operate their computers and many other industrial on-the-job training programs, or the elaborate military constellation of ground, sea, and air educational and training activities).

What about attention of leaders of institutions concerned with enlightenment and skill to the values of power and wealth (as in national security or other public and civic policy arenas, or to criticizing or reinforcing the economic system); to rectitude, affection, and respect (as in affirming the role of church-related colleges; in setting standards about personal and inter-personal behavior; and in committing resources on behalf of well-being to the "benignly neglected," the racial and ethnic minorities, the women who in fact constitute a numerical majority, the physically handicapped, the mentally ill, and the aging, and those especially gifted in arts, letters, commerce, and sciences)?

I propose that participants in institutions of enlightenment and skill join in the service of other values (as well as on behalf of knowledge, art, and craft for their own sakes), and that educational and skill institutions accentuate services for and

to other institutions primarily responsible for other values related to human dignity, and that the participants in enlightenment and skill institutions offer practice in participation in the shaping and sharing of values of human dignity.[4]

Developing or achieving societies regard education as a resource on behalf of societal goals (presumably over and above the goals as defined by the educational institutions). I have stated this theme elsewhere (Robinson, 1977) and will undertake now, however briefly, to formulate it in a different way, one that I believe applies particularly to AASCU-affiliated colleges and universities. If one wishes to contrast vividly the pessimistic and optimistic visions of the future, compare Richard B. Freeman's The Over-Educated American (1976) with Willard Wirtz's The Boundless Resource (1975).

I side with Wirtz's view of the opportunities, although I am painfully aware of the difficulties in leading our institutions to adapt their goals and to reallocate their resources in ways that will enhance their opportunities to share enlightenment and skill more broadly than has heretofore been the distribution among humankind.

Consider that in 1975, unemployment among persons aged 16-19 was nearly 20 percent, a trend that had been increasing for several years. The rate of unemployment among Blacks was approximately twice that of the rest of the population. These are unemployed men and women, not "underemployed" or "over-educated Americans."

Among another stratum of the population, consider the projection that mid-career changes in occupation are likely to increase. Retirement policies in the military, civil, and foreign services have changed and remain under periodic reappraisal and alteration. Similar policies and similar reviews doubtless will extend into academia, eventually reaching tenured faculty from kindergarten through graduate school.

In aggregate terms, Willard Wirtz reports that five million Americans now retire annually; they have an average prospect of fifteen years of social participation before them. Among them are many eager for further education.

In conclusion, I do not believe "the steady state" or "the contracting state" is inevitable in higher education. Notwithstanding previous emphasis on non-traditional students, there is an untapped, if different, clientele waiting to be served. Hodgkinson (1976, p. 39) has noted that the typical "non-traditional students . .

are simply older versions of the conventional college students, 18-24, with whom we are so familiar...male, Caucasian, middle class, fully employed, and making $12,000 to $15,000 a year." (Also see Rosenthal [1977]). The opportunity for our institutions to serve a different audience is at hand. So are the constraints at hand: faculty resistance; managerial rigidities; out-dated incentive systems; the conflicts that the very change that would satisfy all parties would require.

To overcome these constraints requires leadership as well as management. Putting aside pertinent questions about the talents that distinguish these demands, I recommend that governing boards recognize the differences, that they let leaders lead and managers manage and teachers teach and scholars (both faculty and students) learn.

I am not unaware, however, that educational institutions, like most other organizations, are burdened with an impossible demand on the chief executive officer, one that stems from the successive generation of texts on administration full of proverbs that exalt the responsibilities of administrators to the point that they must, like God, know where every sparrow falleth.

The shadow of "the Imperial Presidency" can be found on virtually every campus. That is why the practice of alternating levels between leadership and management appeals to me: put the ship's captain at the helm but leave research to the chief scientist; define the orchestra manager's role and let the conductor select and direct the program; assign the hospital administrator responsibility for the organization but leave the practice of medicine to physicians; separate the roles of museum director and curator, as the Metropolitan Museum of Art elected to try (Kramer, 1977). In short, distinguish leadership from management functions and appropriately recruit individuals with distinctive talents and assign them at different layers of authority and responsibilities. Then, take care not to demand or expect omnicompetence from either.

Author's Note

I appreciate the hospitality and support of The American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Mershon Center of The Ohio State University, which together with the governing board to which I am responsible, The Florida Board of Regents of the State University System, made possible a brief leave of absence during which colleagues in Washington, Columbus, Tallahassee, and Pensacola encouraged me to organize these reflections. Institutions, said Emerson, are the lengthened shadow of one person: the persons who made possible this link among institutions were Allan W. Ostar of AASCU, Professors Richard C. Snyder

and Charles F. Hermann of OSU, and Chancellor E. T. York, Jr., of SUS. I also have benefited from continuing conversations with several staff members of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. (All these colleagues are, by academic custom, absolved of the consequences of their linkage.)

Footnotes

[1] David D. Henry, Challenges Past, Challenges Present: An Analysis of Higher Education Since 1930. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975. Cf. James Bryant Conant, My Several Lives. Memoirs of a Social Inventor. New York: Harper and Row, 1970, p. 240.

[2] Much to my surprise, I look back upon a period of participation in research on crisis and note the emphasis on "crisis management" and the relative inattention to "crisis leadership." See my essay, "Crisis Decision-Making: An Inventory and Appraisal of Concepts, Theories, Hypotheses, and Techniques of Analysis," in Political Science Annual, Vol. Two, 1969-70. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970, pp. 111-148. That this distribution of attention has not changed seems apparent by consulting Charles F. Hermann, Research Tasks for International Crisis Avoidance and Management. Columbus: The Mershon Center, 1975. Particularly, note the "key words" identified on p. 2 of Professor Hermann's monograph.

If the words we use, or the structure of the language, affect the content of thought, as linguists indicate, the reliance on the terminology of "management" rather than or greater than that of "leadership" takes on added significance.

[3] It would help to have more refined information about the ways in which executives allocate time, surely one of their most precious resources. Lawyers record the lengths of time they devote to individual clients, on the basis of which they charge for their analysis and advice. Similar instruments could be adapted for college and university presidents, or any other category of executives, that would record not only whether time is devoted to external or internal constituencies but to which decision functions, and likewise to which intellectual tasks. Similarly, the same instrument could note the "goals" or "values" that occupy one's time and attention (e.g., power [governance, union contracts]; wealth [fund-raising, budgeting]; enlightenment and skill [curriculum, research, public service, and internal staff development]; rectitude [student, faculty, and non-faculty rights and responsibilities]; respect [giving or receiving of friendship among fellow collegiates or co-workers and within familial obligations; "affirmative action" in admissions, employment and retention]; well-being [looking after one's personal

health, safety, and comfort and/or similar interests of others].

Considerable self-discipline is required to monitor the distribution of one's time in order to record the data pertinent to a simple outline such as this suggests. Lawyers to whom I have talked suggest that their time sheets are not uniformly precise. Cohen and March (1974) asked the secretaries of college presidents to keep details on the allocation of time by the presidents for selected periods. Having worked with a succession of faithful secretaries, I can imagine that it would be an extra chore of some weight to add this as a continuing responsibility to the other frantic demands they have on their time, patience, and endurance (i.e., on their well-being). I have elaborated elsewhere on the problems and opportunities of this form of data collection. See "Participant Observation, Political Internships, and Research," in Political Science Annual, op. cit., pp. 71-110.

[4] Efforts to define and operationalize "human dignity" as an overriding goal have received increasing attention among policy scientists (references too numerous for citation), and, of course, pre-date the self-conscious efforts of this orientation. Representative affirmations that are genuinely trans-national include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the text of which is widely available (e.g., in Ian Brownlie, ed., Basic Documents on Human Rights. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971, pp. 106-112.) Cf. Pope John XXIII, An Invitation to Hope. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967, pp. 52-63, 88-92.

References

Change. "Who's Who in Higher Education," February 1975, pp. 24-31.

Cohen, Michael D., and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Drucker, Peter F., Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Freeman, Richard B., The Over-Educated American. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Hodgkinson, Harold L., "Planning and Management in the Face of the Changing Demographic Picture," in Information and Analysis in the Context of Institutional-State Relationships: The Tie That Divides Us. Proceedings of the 1976 National Assembly, Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1976.

Kramer, Hilton, "When the Man in Charge is Not the Man Who Knows," New York Times, July 3, 1977.

Lasswell, Harold D., "Self-Observation: Recording the Focus of Attention," in Lasswell, The Analysis of Political Behaviour: An Empirical Approach. Hamden, Conn.: Anchor Books, 1966, pp. 279-86.

Lasswell, Harold D., A Pre-View of Policy Sciences. New York: Elsevier, 1971.

Levitt, Theodore, "Management and the 'Post-Industrial' Society," The Public Interest, No. 46, Summer, 1976, pp. 69-103.

Parsons, Talcott, and Gerald M. Platt, The American University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Robinson, James A., "Education in the Service of Other World Values," Commencement Address, School of Public and International Affairs, The George Washington University, May 8, 1977.

Rosenthal, Edward Lee, "Lifelong Learning for Some of the People," Change, August 1977, pp. 44-45.

Wirtz, W. Willard, The Boundless Resource. Washington: New Republic Press, 1975.